

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-20 were presented in this application. Claims 6-10 and 16-20, withdrawn from consideration as a result of a restriction requirement and election, are canceled by this amendment. Independent claims 1 and 11 are amended. Accordingly, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-5 and 11-15 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 5, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of U.S. patent 4,742,287 to Yokoi et al. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected as obvious over AAPA in view of Yokoi et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 5,237,250 to Zelle et al. Claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 are rejected as obvious over AAPA in view of Yokoi et al. and Zelle et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 4,401,931 to Kulterman et al. Applicant traverses these rejections and submits that claims 1-5 and 11-15, as amended, distinguish over the art of record.

Independent claims 1 and 11 are amended to include a document sensor that generates a detection signal when a document is present, and to require that the control unit receive the detection signal and select one of the two motors based on the detection signal. Support for this amendment is found in paragraph 50 of applicant's specification. The selection and operation of stepping motors STM1 and STM2 of Yokoi et al., in contrast, is not based on a detection signal indicating the presence of a document. Rather, as noted by the Action, the operation of these motors is based exclusively on operation timings that are not mutually superimposed.

Since all elements of claims 1 and 11, as amended, are not taught or suggested by AAPA in view of Yokoi et al., claims 1 and 11 cannot be rendered obvious by AAPA and Yokoi et al. The references applied to the dependent claims, Zelle et al. and Kulterman et al., also do not teach or suggest selection between

Appl. No. 09/837,006
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81800.0155
Customer No.: 26021


motors based on a detection signal generated by a document sensor. For these reasons, applicant submits that the rejections of claims 1-5 and 11-15 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in allowable form. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: October 14, 2004

By: 
Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701